

REMARKS

In accordance with the foregoing, the title and claims 1, 11, 21 and 24 are amended. No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Claims 12-15, 20, 22-23 and 25 previously withdrawn by the Examiner are cancelled herein without prejudice or disclaimer.

Claims 1-11, 21, and 24 are pending and under consideration. Reconsideration is requested.

Claim Amendments

Independent claim 1 is amended herein to recite a method "eliminating at least one power supply pad when the current value of each of the power supply pads does not exceed the current capacity of the associated IO buffer." Independent claims 11, 21, and 24 are similarly amended.

Support for the amendments is found, for example, on page 15, lines 14-18 of the specification.

No new matter is being presented, and approval and entry are respectfully requested.

Item 4: Objection to Specification: Title

In item 4 of the specification, the Examiner objects to the title as not descriptive and suggests a title. The title is amended herein as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant submits that the title is descriptive and request the objection be withdrawn.

Items 6-13: Rejection of claims 1-11, 21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Tuan et al. (U.S.P. 6,311,147) in view of Ito (U.S.P. 5,946,477)

In items 6-13 of the Office Action, the Examiner rejects claims 1-11, 21, and 24 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable by Tuan in view of Ito. The rejection is traversed.

Independent claim 1, as amended herein, recites a method "eliminating or adding at least one power supply pad in accordance with the result of the determination; and eliminating at least one power supply pad when the current value of each of the power supply pads does not exceed the current capacity of the associated IO buffer (emphasis added)."

Independent claims 11, 21, and 24, all as amended herein, have similar recitations.

Applicants submit that the art relied on by the Examiner does not teach features recited by each of the independent claims even in an *arguendo* combination.

The Action concedes that Tuan does not disclose:

eliminating or adding (modifying) at least one power supply pad with respect to the result of the determination.

(Action at page 4, lines 13-15).

By contrast Ito merely teaches:

performing insertion/positioning of at least a pair of power supply test pads or the pair of test pads and chip terminals which are connected to the pair of power supply lines in each of the plurality of groups in the form of rows by performing layout position adjustment of the input/output buffers, and when a length of one of the rows of the input/output buffers exceeds a length of one side of the semiconductor chip upon the insertion/positioning, performing layout position adjustment by further dividing the row of the input/output buffers into small groups such that all the input/output buffers are distributed and belong to the small groups.

(See, for example, col. 4, lines 28 - 38).

As the Examiner asserts, Ito teaches

[P]rovisionally determining quantity and positions of a plurality of power supply pads when designing a semiconductor integrated circuit. . . including. . . . rearrangement power pad by performing insertion/positioning of at least a pair power supply test pads . . . the number and position of power supply pads/terminals are inserted in each row of input/output buffers as reference pad.

(Emphasis added, Action at page 4, line 16 - page 5, line 18).

That is, as the Examiner asserts, Ito merely teaches a rearrangement of power pads by performing insertion/positioning of at least a pair power supply test pads.

Accordingly, neither Tuan nor Ito, alone or in *arguendo* combination, teach a method or apparatus "eliminating" at least one power supply pad, let alone, and a method or apparatus eliminating at least one power supply pad when the current value of each of the power supply pads does not exceed the current capacity of the associated IO buffer, as recited by independent claim 1, for example.

Summary

Since features recited by each of independent claims 1, 11, 21, and 24 (and dependent claims 2-10) are not taught or suggested by even an *arguendo* combination of the art relied on by the Examiner, the rejections should be withdrawn and claims 1-11, 21 and 24 allowed.

Conclusion

There being no further outstanding objections or rejections, it is submitted that the application is in condition for allowance. An early action to that effect is courteously solicited.

Finally, if there are any formal matters remaining after this response, the Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned to attend to these matters.

Serial No. 10/823,649

If there are any additional fees associated with filing of this Amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3935.

Respectfully submitted,

STAAS & HALSEY LLP

Date: December 17, 2007

By: Paul W. Bobowiec
Paul W. Bobowiec
Registration No. 47,431

1201 New York Avenue, N.W., 7th Floor
Washington, D.C. 20005
Telephone: (202) 434-1500
Facsimile: (202) 434-1501